DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 031 247 JC 690 288

By-Maloney, Clark M.

Attitudes of Missouri Public Junior College Faculty Toward the Objectives of the Comprehensive Junior College.

Pub Date [69]

Note-8p.; NDEA Institute paper

EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$0.50

Descriptors-*Attitude Tests, Comprehensive Programs, *Educational Objectives, *Junior Colleges, *Opinions, *Teacher Attitudes

Identifiers-*Missouri

As attitudes of an organization's members are important in attaining its goals, this study proposed to determine faculty attitudes to comprehensive college aims. Selected as subjects were 100 full-time instructors from Missouri public junior colleges. The investigator expected to find transfer faculty more favorable to general and transfer curricula, and technical faculty more favorable to adult, occupational, counseling, and community service programs. He sought opinions on the college's objectives in occupational, general, transfer or pre-professional, part-time or adult, community service, and counseling and guidance programs. The subjects were sent a 35-item questionnaire; 60% responded. Over 70% agreed with the overall college objectives; 52.3% disagreed with the transfer program. Points of agreement were: 68.7% of transfer faculty and 71.4% of technical faculty on occupational programs; 81.6% of transfer and 73.1% of technical faculty on general education; 83.3% of transfer and 69.9% of technical faculty on community service; 78.5% of transfer and 68.4% of technical faculty on counseling; only 39.4% of transfer and 34% of technical faculty on transfer objectives. At least 70% of all faculty agreed on all but the transfer function, an attitude worth further study. The investigator suggests that particular attention should be paid to attitudes of the more influential faculty members and that a stronger orientation program is needed, especially for those who are undecided. (HH)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

ATTITUDES OF MISSOURI PUBLIC JUNIOR COLLEGE FACULTY TOWARD THE OBJECTIVES OF THE COMPREHENSIVE JUNIOR COLLEGE

Clark M. Maloney, University of Missouri

Writers in the junior college field have implied that the attitudes of faculty toward the objectives of the comprehensive junior college is less than desirable. Blocker (1965) quotes from an unpublished doctoral dissertation which indicates that faculty in junior colleges consider the transfer function the major and most important function of the junior college. The study also revealed that faculty were critical of lower admission standards and the community service emphasis. Blocker (1965) also quotes from a speech by Norman Harris, in which Harris states that if the occupational program is going to function effectively in the junior college, the attitudes of the faculty will have to change. Blocker concludes by stating "Community colleges must have faculty of well-qualified teachers who understand the place and function of community colleges and who are dedicated to this type of education."

Roger Garrison (1967), in a clinical study of junior college faculty, indicates that the faculty is favorable to the open-door policy and student-centeredness of the comprehensive junior college. This contrast indicates that attitudes about the comprehensive junior college are being variously attributed to junior college faculty.

Attitude theorists (Jahoda & Warren, 1966) have long emphasized the importance of attitudes of members of an organization in implementing the goals of that organization. Because of the effect of attitudes on the overall objectives of the institution, it is important to determine them. Medsker (1960) suggests that, perhaps, "...the lack of emphasis on the terminal function, the minimal concern about general education, and the inadequacies in student personnel

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF
LOS ANGELES
JUL 23 1969
CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGE
INFORMATION

services..." are a result of faculty negative attitudes.

The purpose of this study was to systematically study the attitudes of public junior college faculty in Missouri toward the objectives of the comprehensive institution. Specific attention was given to a transfer and occupational faculty. Medsker (1960) found the following:

1. Forty-five percent of junior college faculty preferred to teach in a four-year school.
2. The faculty teaching applied subjects had more regard for the transfer program than the academic faculty had for the technical-vocational program.
3. Remedial and adult education was not considered important relative to the transfer and technical-vocational program.
4. "Open-door" policy is favored by only half of junior college faculty.
5. Counseling was considered important by junior college faculty.

Medsker's study indicates that the objectives of the comprehensive institution are viewed differently by the transfer and occupational faculty.

The investigator expected that the transfer faculty would be more favorable than the occupational faculty toward: 1. general education; 2. transfer, based on Medsker's study. The technical faculty would be more favorable toward: 1. occupational; 2. adult-education; 3. counseling; 4. community service.

Method

The term junior college was defined as "any public, local two-year institution within a separate district." A recent study (Smith, 1968) has indicated that the objectives of a comprehensive junior college are:

1. Occupation education of post-high school level.
2. General education for all categories of students.
3. Transfer or pre-professional education.
4. Part-time (or adult) education.

5. Community service.

6. Counseling and guidance of students.

For the purpose of this paper, objectives 4 and 5 were combined.

The population of this study was all full-time teaching faculty, excluding department chairmen, of all public junior college districts in the state of Missouri in operation at least a year. A random sample of 100 subjects was selected from this population.

The instrument used to elicit attitudes was a 35 item questionnaire. This questionnaire contained 7 statements reflecting each of the above stated objectives. The questionnaire was developed in the following manner:

1. A pool of items was presented to three community college authorities.

2. They were asked to indicate what objective, if any, the particular item reflected.

3. Only items were used that were judged as reflecting a particular objective by all three judges.

The questionnaire was sent to all members of the sample via U. S. Mail. A follow-up letter was sent one week later.

Results

Forty-nine percent of the sample responded to the first mailing. The second mailing produced 11% more for a total of 60% returning the questionnaire. Over 70% of the respondents agreed or strongly agreed with the objectives of the comprehensive junior college with one notable exception. Fifty-two and three tenths percent of the respondents disagreed or strongly disagreed with the transfer objective of the junior college.

The transfer faculty, combining strongly agree and agree category, were 68.7% in agreement with the occupational function, compared with 71.4% of the occupational faculty. The occupational faculty were 20.4% undecided about the occupational objective of the junior college, while 16.7% of the transfer

faculty disagreed or strongly disagreed with the occupational objective as indicated by Table 1.

Regarding the general education objective, both the transfer faculty (86.1%) and the occupational faculty (73.1%) were in agreement with this objective. Seventeen percent of the occupational faculty were undecided about this objective.

The community service objective, including adult education, found 83.3% of the transfer faculty in agreement and 69.9% of the occupational faculty in agreement. Again, 17.5% of the occupational faculty were undecided.

The counseling and guidance function had 78.5% of the transfer faculty and 68.4% of the occupational faculty in agreement. Fifteen and three-tenths percent of the occupational faculty were undecided and 15.3% disagreed with this objective.

Insert Table 1 about here

The transfer objective found only 39.4% of the transfer faculty in agreement and 34.0% of the occupational faculty. The transfer faculty disagreed or strongly disagreed with this objective 52.4%, as did 52.4% of the occupational faculty.

Discussion

It is encouraging that at least 70% of all respondents agree with the occupational, general education, community service and counseling objectives of the comprehensive junior college. Medsker (1960) also found that there was strong agreement on the multiple functions of the junior college.

The results of faculty attitude toward the transfer objective raises several interesting questions. First, the variability of responses indicates that the items in the questionnaire intended to elicit attitudes about this objective, were different than items eliciting attitudes about the other objectives. Reviewing these items, the investigator found this to be true. Items eliciting transfer attitudes were more "all or none" items than the other

items, i.e., the respondent had to agree or disagree with the transfer function as more important than the other objectives. Assuming this interpretation, still 37.9% of the faculty agreed with the transfer function being the single most important objective of the junior college. If this is the case, junior college leaders have a large task ahead to orient these people to the comprehensive junior college.

Comparing the transfer and technical faculty, one finds that only in the general education and community service objectives was there substantial disagreement, with the transfer faculty having a more favorable attitude toward those objectives. It should be noted here that the occupational faculty was less favorable (less per cent of agreement) on all the objectives except the occupational objectives. This finding contradicts Medsker's (1960) statement that applied faculty are more likely to support the over-all program of the comprehensive junior college. Perhaps junior college administrators, in an attempt to orient the transfer faculty to the comprehensiveness of the junior college, have over-indulged the occupational faculty. As an example, 30.6% of the occupational faculty are undecided or disagree with the counseling objective.

This study suggests that junior college faculty, though generally supporting the multiple functions of the community, contains some members that are not in agreement with these multiple functions. Because of this, it is important for individual institutions to systematically assess the attitudes of their members. An added aspect of this research would be to specifically assess the attitudes of those that are most influential in the environment. This study did not do that, but it would be interesting to see if the influential members of the transfer and occupational faculty express attitudes similar to the results of this study.

The results presented also indicate a need for a strong orientation program for faculty. The relatively large percentage in the undecided category would

be very susceptible to and benefit from such a program. This is especially true of the occupational faculty in which the percent of undecided ranges from 12.3% to 20.4%.

In conclusion, junior college faculty are expressing positive attitudes about the comprehensive junior college. Two findings of this study deserve further investigation and considerations: 1. the relative lack of agreement by the occupational faculty indicates an orientation emphasis directed toward this group. 2. the transfer faculty appears to have polarized into two camps. One camp expressing attitudes about the transfer function to the exclusion of the other functions, and the other camp appearing to have balance regarding the functions.

References

Blocker, Clyde, Plummer, R.H. and Richardson, Richard, The Two-Year College: A Social Synthesis, Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc. 1965.

Garrison, Roger, Junior College Faculty: Issues and Problems, Washington,D.C.: American Association of Junior Colleges, 1967.

Jahoda, Marie and Warren, Neil, Attitudes, Baltimore, Md.: Penguin Books,Inc. 1966.

Medsker, Leland, The Junior College: Progress and Prospect, New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc. 1960.

Smith, Max, Director, Final Report, Missouri Public Junior College Study, Jefferson City, Missouri: Missouri Commission on Higher Education, July 1968.

Table 1

Percent Agreement-Disagreement of Faculty Attitudes toward the Objectives of Public Junior College

Objective	Faculty	SA	A	U	D	SD
Occupational	Transfer*	15.6	53.1	14.2	13.4	3.3
	Occupational**	20.4	51.0	20.4	8.2	0
	Total	17.0***	53.7	15.5	11.6	2.2
General Education	Transfer	37.4	48.7	7.8	3.7	2.6
	Occupational	23.1	50.0	17.3	6.7	2.9
	Total	31.1	50.2	11.5	4.4	2.7
Community Service	Transfer	25.1	58.2	11.3	4.0	1.4
	Occupational	15.5	54.4	17.5	9.7	2.9
	Total	21.8	58.7	12.4	5.1	1.9
Counseling & Guidance	Transfer	19.9	58.6	9.8	10.2	1.5
	Occupational	16.3	53.1	15.3	15.3	0
	Total	18.4	56.1	12.8	11.3	1.5
Transfer	Transfer	14.0	25.4	8.1	36.9	15.5
	Occupational	7.8	26.2	13.6	34.9	17.5
	Total	12.2	25.7	9.8	36.2	16.1

Note.- SA - strongly agree, A - agree, U - undecided, D - disagree, SD - strongly disagree

* 40 returnees

** 15 returnees

*** Totals include five returns that did not designate their teaching assignments.